

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHEASTERN DIVISION**

GENESIS MICHAEL LINDSEY,
Plaintiff,

v.

**NORTHERN DISTRICT MORGAN
DISTRICT COUNTY ALABAMA,**
Defendant.

Case No. 5:25-cv-109-CLM-SGC

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff Genesis Michael Lindsey originally filed this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Alabama. (Doc. 1). But the Middle District transferred the case here—to the Northern District of Alabama—on January 15, 2025. (Doc. 5). This court then ordered Lindsey to either pay the filing fee or apply to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”). (Doc. 8). The court warned Lindsey that if he failed to do so within 30 days, his lawsuit might be dismissed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to prosecute. (*See id.*).


The deadline passed, but this court did not receive an IFP application or the required fees. So the magistrate judge entered a report recommending the court dismiss this case without prejudice. (Doc. 15). The magistrate judge advised Lindsey that he could object to the Report and Recommendation within 14 days, but to date, the court has received no objections.

But on March 14, 2025, the court received from the middle district additional filings from Lindsey, including two IFP motions. (Docs. 16-18). It appears that Lindsey continued to submit filings to that court even though his case had been transferred to this court—the Northern District. (*Id.*). Because Lindsey’s IFP motions did not include the required certified copy of his jail account statements for the last six months, the court denied the motions. (Doc. 20). The court also ordered Lindsey to submit another IFP application, along with a certified copy of his jail account statements, within

14 days. (*Id.*). The court warned Lindsey that if he failed to do so, his lawsuit could be dismissed without further notice for failure to prosecute. (*Id.*). That deadline has also passed, but the court has not received an updated IFP motion or the required certified copy of Lindsey's jail account statements for the last six months.¹

After careful consideration of the record in this case and the magistrate judge's report, the court **ADOPTS** the report and **ACCEPTS** the recommendation. (Doc. 15). Consistent with that recommendation, the court will dismiss this case without prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

Done on May 1, 2025.



COREY L. MAZE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ On April 28, 2025, the court received three additional filings from Lindsey. (Docs. 21-23). None of those filings appear related to this action. Instead, they reference (1) hear damage allegedly suffered by Mary Catherine Lindsey due to a heart mesh implant; (2) a February 2023 complaint concerning an “ashtray-workable-useable bolted to the side of the wall to the maintenance of Doors to the Morgan County Post Office;” and (3) Marie Catherine Lindsey's estate assets and burial insurance policy. (*See id.*).